

## Safety Stand Down Summary

June 11, 2003

Chehalis, WA

The meeting was scheduled to begin at 2 PM. The meeting actually began at 2:15 PM. The meeting was conducted for the Chehalis and Toledo sheds. Approximately 15 people attended.

### **Introduction:**

The Stand Down Plan suggested a 15-minute introduction.

Frank Newboles and Rex Swartz gave an introduction to the session. This included information on who we were, the purpose of the meeting. Paul Simonson, the maintenance superintendent, acted as the facilitator of the session and also gave an introduction. He used the written introduction from the Stand Down Plan.

The workers took 10 minutes to ask questions about what was going to become of the information and was management committed to making improvements with any information that they came up with. The group asked why they were here, and what will this accomplish? There seemed to be a credibility gap stemming from past unresolved safety issues. It might be a good idea to anticipate this and cover the intent and framework of the stand down with an actual plan for addressing the hazards/solutions brought forth from the crews.

Several questions were then directed toward Frank and I, asking about what we did and questions regarding accident details of what happened with Jake Baardson. The group had difficulty getting started. In the end the Introduction Phase took 45 minutes to conduct

The crew had completed the survey before the session but the facilitator had not received the information in time to review it. It would have been good to be able to refer to the survey and perhaps briefly summarize some of the findings to set the tone for the meeting.

Additional Issues that should be discussed during the Introduction Phase are:

- This is your meeting, your opportunity to have input. If you don't participate you miss an opportunity and the hazards will still be there. "We don't have a problem" is not an acceptable position to take.
- This is your problem.....not that you are doing anything wrong, but know that high speed traffic presents a hazard and we can only do so much to control that

hazard, we need to take a hard look at when we can reduce our exposure to those hazards.

- Why are you here? Crews have the knowledge and managers need to set priorities based on the need to address the hazards. The climate is ripe to further the cause of worker safety.....the WZSTF, Management and we believe the Legislature is open to help address this issue.
- Example hazards.....need to give some specific hazard examples and how they might be mitigated to help get the group in that mindset.
- Example solutions.....Think out of the box! Everything is fair game, but focus on those solutions that are under the crews control as a place to start. We can work up the ladder on issues of funding, training, policy, etc.

### **Split Meeting: 30 minutes**

The meeting was then split between the Group #1 the Crew and Group #2 the Superintendent, Supervisor and lead tech.

Rex went with group 1 and Frank went with the group 2. In group 1, no one assumed the lead. One person voluntarily went to the board and wrote down hazardous tasks, the hazard and solutions. Discussion was random and scattered among small groups and was not focused. Gradually some started working with the person at the board to record the hazards.

The group had a tendency to focus on the big picture and not get very detailed. Possible solutions were items beyond which they could influence such as wider shoulders, more lanes, more WSP usage, and better equipment and they did not focus on what they could do to improve their safety.

Group 2 worked effectively, brainstorming and listing the top hazards. Paul Simonsen took the lead. 30 minutes is probably a reasonable time to conduct this phase of the stand down effort, assuming the surveys are available to use as a resource. It's important to ensure that the surveys have been done and the "facilitator" is somewhat familiar with the survey information.

### **Combined Brainstorming:**

Both groups came back together and began discussing what each group did. 10 minutes were taken recording the other group's information onto one of the two front white boards. While this was being done the group had unfocused idle discussion. Each spokesperson then discussed what their group had come up with.

The hazardous tasks that each group came up with were similar.

A third white board was started which had five columns; task, hazard, solutions, obstacles, action.

The combined group worked to transfer the information about the top 3 consensus hazardous tasks to the 3<sup>rd</sup> board and flesh out the detail where needed. Frank was instrumental in periodically leading the discussion on these items and urging them to be more detailed about what they could do to minimize the risk. The facilitator did not attempt to take the lead during this phase but let the ideas develop within the group

The group tended to continue to identify things beyond that which they had direct influence. They did not readily address things that they might be able to do. With some prompts from both Frank and I, they began to get more specific on what they might be able to do.

At the end of the meeting Paul Simonson appointed a group of four volunteers to study the action items and make recommendations that will be discussed at a follow-up meeting in August. Paul thought that several of the identified actions could probably be done.

### **Recommendations:**

1. The Safety Stand Down session length should be three to four hours. This session lasted three hours and the participant's commented on the need for more time.
2. Surveys should be completed by all participants and reviewed by the facilitator(s) before the beginning of the session.
3. A facilitator should be identified for the overall session and both break out groups.
4. During the Introduction, emphasize the need to think out of the box! Everything is fair game, but focus on those solutions that are under the crews control as a place to start. Solutions that are beyond the crews control may be worked up the chain of command such as issues of funding, training, policy, etc.
5. Record one group's notes on flip charts and the other group's notes on a white board or flip chart. During a short break after the breakout session, the results of the both groups should be displayed together for comparison by the combined group and for ease of merging both notes into the final top three hazardous tasks, hazard, solution, obstacles and action plan.
6. Select a work group from the participants to work on the completion of the action items.
7. Forward a copy of the meeting results along with copies of the surveys to the regional; safety and traffic office and the Headquarters Safety Office.

### Meeting Results:

<b>3 Most Hazardous Tasks</b>	<b>Hazards</b>	<b>Solution</b>	<b>Obstacles</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>Transition Traffic Control</b>	<b>Impaired Drivers</b>	<b>Regulate speed</b>	<b>RA Sign (Reg Signs</b>	<b>WSP - Drone</b>
	<b>Elderly Drivers</b>	<b>WSP</b>	<b>WSP \$</b>	<b>Revising Work Methods</b>
	<b>Weather</b>	<b>More Lanes</b>	<b>Equipment \$</b>	<b>Driver Padding / Helmet</b>
	<b>No Escape Route</b>	<b>Better Equipment</b>	<b>Construction \$</b>	<b>Cone Shooter</b>
	<b>Protection</b>	<b>Cone Shooter</b>		
		<b>Driver Padding / TMA or Two TMAs</b>		
<b>Litter Pick-up</b>	<b>Debris in Lanes</b>	<b>WSP – Rolling slow down</b>	<b>Debris Picker</b>	<b>Explore Debris Picker</b>
	<b>Weather/ lane Ruts</b>	<b>Better Pavement</b>	<b>Mechanic \$</b>	<b>Get or buy strobes</b>
	<b>Traffic Volume</b>	<b>Wear PPE</b>		
	<b>Speed</b>	<b>Debris Picker</b>		
	<b>Flying Debris</b>			
<b>Sweeping</b>	<b>Weather</b>	<b>Good Weather</b>	<b>No Choice</b>	<b>Advanced Planning</b>
	<b>Driver confusion</b>	<b>Clear signs/ advanced signs</b>	<b>Bob Cat Avail.</b>	<b>Get new Brooms &amp; Sweeper</b>
	<b>Impaired drivers</b>	<b>Low Volume &amp; Night Sweeping</b>	<b>Darkness</b>	<b>Vacuum Sweeper</b>
	<b>Distraction</b>	<b>WSP</b>	<b>WSP \$</b>	<b>Water Truck</b>
	<b>Traffic speed</b>			
	<b>No escape</b>			